



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,464	09/09/2003	Kung-Li Deng	134239	4724

6147 7590 06/01/2006
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
GLOBAL RESEARCH
PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309

EXAMINER

VARGOT, MATHIEU D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1732

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1. Applicant's election of Species A in the reply filed on March 14, 2006 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al (see col. 6, line 28 and col. 7, line 4) in view of Mikami et al essentially for reasons of record noting the following.

Suzuki et al teaches using a trifluoroethyl methacrylate—see col. 7, line 4—and such is submitted as rendering the instant tetrafluoropropyl methacrylate as obvious thereover. Also, see col. 6, line 28 for a disclosure of an epoxy monomer.

3. Applicant's arguments filed December 6, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments concerning claims 13 and 19-23 are persuasive and these claims are hereby either objected to or allowed, respectively, since the prior art does not disclose or suggest the aspects set forth in these claims of using a splitter. However, the remaining claims are rejected for reasons of record. The exact fluororesin used is submitted to have been within the skill level of the art given the disclosure in Suzuki et al. Chandross et al has been dropped from the rejection as being cumulative with respect to Suzuki et al.


Art Unit: 1732

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson, can be reached on 571 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot
May 29, 2006


Mathieu D. Vargot
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1732

